

REMARKS

In the above-mentioned Office Action, all of the pending claims were rejected under Section 102(e) over Vialen.

Responsive to the rejection of the claims, independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended, as set forth herein, in manners believed better to distinguish the invention of the present application over the cited reference.

With respect to claim 1, the claim has been amended now to recite that the method is comprised in a User Equipment (UE) mobile communications device. The first operation of determining has been amended, now to recite an operation of determining whether the UE mobile telecommunications device has an empty cell identifier variable.

The second operation of determining, that is, the operation of determining whether the CUC message includes a new value for the cell identifier, is amended, now to recite that the operation is performed when the UE mobile telecommunication device has an empty cell identifier variable.

The operation of carrying out at least one further step prior to entering the state is amended, now to recite that the operation is performed when the CUC message includes a new value for the cell identifier and the CUC message would cause the UE mobile telecommunications device to enter a state that requires the UE mobile telecommunications device to respond to the message before entering the state.

Claim 9 has been analogously amended, now to recite apparatus included at a User Equipment device.

Recited as now-amended, the claims are believed to be patentably distinguishable over Vialen.

Review of Vialen indicates that the reference pertains generally to UMTS networks and signaling. Figures 4 and 5 and their corresponding description at column 7, line 31 through column 8, line 37, relates to cell update confirm (CUC) messages and URA update messages.

More specifically, Figure 4 appears to relate to CCCH or DCCH procedures, such as Cell Update, URA Update, RRC Connection Re-establishment or paging response procedures. According to the description at column 7, line 42, upon receipt of a cell update message from the UE to the UTRAN, a C-RNTI is allocated to the UE. The C-RNTI is noted to be sent in a message from the CRNC to the SRNC. The SRNC processes the message. The SRNC then orders the CNRC to reply to the UE by sending a response message and the CRNC sends a CONFIRM message to the UE.

There is no disclosure, or inference, however, of whether the C-RNTI is sent to the UE and, if so, what the UE does in response. Accordingly, there is no disclosure of the method steps set forth in claim 1, as now-amended, or in the structure recited in claim 9, as now-amended.

Additionally, while column 7, lines 63-65 of Vialen state that, "in another embodiment of the invention, the C-RNTI is sent directly from the SRNC to the UE using the normal message transfer mechanism", there is no disclosure as to a response of the UE.

Accordingly, there is no disclosure in Vialen that, upon receipt of a cell update confirm message from a UTRAN, the UE carries out the steps recited in claim 1, as now-amended.

As the dependent claims include all of the limitations of their respective parent claims, these claims are believed to be patentably distinguishable for the same reasons as those given with respect to their parent claims.


In light of the foregoing, therefore, independent claims 1 and 9, and the dependent claims dependent claims thereon, are believed, as-amended, to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration for allowance of these claims is respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Appl. No. 10/674,109
Amdt. dated 28 November 2005
Reply to Office Action of 28 July 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 28 Nov 05

SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.
5956 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400
Dallas, Texas 75225
Telephone: (214) 706-4201
Fax: (214) 706-4242
robert.kelly@scheefandstone.com


Robert H. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,922